IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Michael Woodruff, # 275658,)	C/A No. 5:12-344-RMG-KDW
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
William Byars, Director; Warden Edsel)	OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
Taylor; IGC Georgina Ramey; HCA)	
Darnell Harrison; Dr. G. Amonitti,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

Plaintiff, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought this action alleging violations of his constitutional rights pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on April 19, 2012. ECF No. 33. As Plaintiff is proceeding pro se, the court entered an order on April 19, 2012, pursuant to *Roseboro v. Garrison*, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975), advising him of the importance of a motion to dismiss and of the need for him to file an adequate response. ECF No. 35. Plaintiff was informed that his response was due by May 24, 2012, and was specifically advised that if he failed to respond adequately, Defendants' motion may be granted, thereby ending this case.

On June 1, 2012, the court ordered Plaintiff to advise whether he wished to continue with the case by June 14, 2012. ECF No. 42. Plaintiff has filed no response. As such, it appears to the court that he does not oppose the motion and wishes to abandon this action. Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends this action be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See Davis v. Williams*, 588 F.2d 69, 70 (4th Cir. 1978); Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.

June 19, 2012 Florence, South Carolina Kaymani D. West

United States Magistrate Judge

The parties are directed to note the important information in the attached "Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation."